

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 778

TM 840 196

AUTHOR Guba, Egon G.
TITLE The Impact of Various Definitions of "Policy" on the Nature and Outcomes of Policy Analysis.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (68th, New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984). Small print in tables.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Definitions; Evaluation Methods; *Policy; Policy Formation; *Research Methodology; Research Problems; Semantics
IDENTIFIERS *Policy Analysis

ABSTRACT

The impact of various definitions of the term "policy" on the nature and outcomes of policy analysis is illustrated by noting a variety of definitions which are implied in the literature. These definitions are applied to exemplar policy arenas to note their differential effect. The policy arenas discussed include the community corrections program within the criminal justice field, program of education for all handicapped students under Public Law 94-142, and the process of college and university accreditation by regional accreditation associations. Eight different definitions of policy are considered. Table 1 illustrates policy types, determiners, appearances, and proximity to point of action for eight definitions of policy. Table 2 examines the policy question, data collected, data sources, methodology, and policy products for the eight definitions of policy in the three exemplar areas. The results of this study indicate the importance of indicating the specific definition of policy used in an analysis. (DWH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED242778

THE IMPACT OF VARIOUS DEFINITIONS OF "POLICY" ON
THE NATURE AND OUTCOMES OF POLICY ANALYSIS

EGON G. GUBA

Indiana University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. G. Guba

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of
The American Educational Research Association
New Orleans, LA: April, 1984

© 1984, Egon G. Guba

TM 840 196

Introduction¹

The reading of even a few references in the literature of policy analysis is sufficient to demonstrate that the term policy is not defined in any uniform way; indeed, the term is rarely defined at all. Authors of policy papers, monographs, and books seem to assume that their readers will know what the term means. Of course these authors have at least an implicit or tacit definition in mind, which shapes what they have to say; they apparently assume that the reader shares this definition.

An analysis of these implied definitions quickly demonstrates, however, that they are very different indeed. Hence the probability that a given reader will have a different definition in mind is high, which fact, at the least, might result in miscommunication and confusion. But there is another problem of far more serious consequence, viz., that the particular definition assumed by the analyst shapes (determines, constrains) the kinds of policy questions that are asked, the kinds of policy-relevant data which are collected, the sources of data that are tapped, the methodology which is used, and, finally, the policy products which emerge, but that the reader will not be aware of those influences. If reader and analyst operate from different definitions, it is quite likely that the reader will find the policy products irrelevant at best and pernicious at worst. Moreover, analyses that emerge from different definitions differ sufficiently among themselves so that it becomes possible to predetermine what the policy analyses will produce by the simple act of choosing the guiding definition. The political and ethical implications of this possibility are enormous.

The purpose of this essay is to illustrate this problem by, first, noting a variety of definitions of policy which are implied in the liter-

ature, and second, applying these various definitions in three exemplar policy arenas to note their differential effect.

The Three Exemplar Policy Arenas

Three widely different fields have been chosen for the purpose of these analyses. These are:

1. The community corrections program within the criminal justice field (to be abbreviated throughout as CJCC). The concept of community corrections is based on the assumption that retaining offenders in their home communities is a more effective way of dealing with them than is sending them to prison. Felons who have committed the less serious felony crimes (typically referred to as Class C felonies) are eligible for sentencing to programs such as: drug rehabilitation, alcohol treatment, job skills development, personal/psychological counseling, marital/family counseling, work release, victim restitution, half-way house, parole, probation, vocational training, community service, or employment/placement counseling. Because the offenders are retained in their home communities and in close touch with families, it is presumed that rehabilitation probabilities are improved. Moreover, court case loads and prison overloads may be substantially reduced. Punishments may more closely fit the crime. Possible negative effects are increased risk to the general public, increases in plea bargains (since lesser offenders become eligible), and increases in "the web of control," that is, the number of persons who remain under active supervision as compared to a "prison or release" situation.

2. The program of education for all handicapped students under Public Law 94-142 (to be abbreviated throughout as SPED--special education). P.L. 94-142, passed in 1975, requires that all students regardless of

handicap are entitled to receive a free, appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment consistent with the pupil's handicap. The least restrictive environment provision is usually interpreted to mean that the pupil shall insofar as possible be assigned to a "regular" classroom--and is usually denoted with the phrase, "mainstreaming the student." When a pupil is suspected of having a handicapping condition, he or she is referred, tested, diagnosed, and staffed in an elaborate form of "due process" in which parents of the child must be intimately involved. If the child is found to be handicapped, an "individual educational program" (IEP) must be prepared which stipulates in detail the program of instruction which that child is to receive, including placement, objectives, methods, timing, and so on. The IEP is reviewed at a maximum of every three years. Possible negative effects are increased stigma for the child, excessive legalism, excessive paperwork for teachers and administrators, and instruction within the regular classroom setting by teachers ill prepared to deal with even mildly handicapped youngsters.

3. The process of accreditation of colleges and universities by regional accreditation associations such as the North Central Association, the Mid-States Association, and the like (to be abbreviated throughout as HEAC). Colleges and universities wishing to be accredited by a regional association must apply for accreditation and stand close scrutiny in terms of certain defined standards of accreditation. Previously accredited institutions must undergo inspection at least every ten years; inspections may be scheduled more frequently if it is believed necessary or if the institution applies for a new level of program. Candidate institutions must prepare a lengthy "self-study" which provides information relevant to the standards (e.g., faculty qualifications), and must submit to inspection by a site-visit team composed of "evaluator-consultants," retained

by the accrediting agency and composed of experts competent to make judgments in the field in which accreditation is sought (typically the full gamut of colleges and professional schools). The team leader prepares a report based on the individual findings of team members; this report, which contains an accreditation recommendation, may be challenged by the institution if it is believed to be inaccurate or ill-found. A variety of grievance steps exist for the airing of such appeals. Possible negative effects of the accreditation process include external control over institutional policies, development of self-study reports which put the institution's "best foot forward" while "covering up" faults, and emphasis by the team on providing "leverage" to institutional administrators rather than on overall accreditation issues.

Definitions of Policy to be Included

Eight different definitions of policy will be considered; the definitions are simply listed below, and some additional comments will be made thereafter:

1. Policy is an assertion of intents or goals.
2. Policy is a governing body's "standing decisions" by which it regulates, controls, promotes, services, and otherwise influences matters within its sphere of authority.
3. Policy is a guide to discretionary action.
4. Policy is a strategy undertaken to solve or ameliorate some problem.
5. Policy is sanctioned behavior, formally through authoritative decisions, or informally through expectations and acceptance, established over ("sanctified by") time.
6. Policy is a norm of conduct, characterized by consistency and regularity, in some substantive action area.
7. Policy is the output of the policy-making system: the cumulative effect of all the actions, decisions, and behaviors of the millions of people who work in bureaucracies. It occurs, takes place, and is made at every point in the policy cycle, from agenda-setting to policy impact. As such, policy is an analytic category.

8. Policy is the impact of the policy-making and policy-implementing system as it is experienced by the client.

These eight definitions are displayed in short-hand form in Table 1. Several other points are also made in this table:

1. There are three policy types implied by these eight definitions. Policy definitions 1 through 4 treat policy as policy-in-intention, that is, as statements about policy. Definitions 5 through 7 treat policy as policy-in-implementation, that is, as behaviors or activities that are displayed in the process of implementing policy. Definition 8 treats policy as policy-in-experience, that which is actually experienced by the client.

2. Different policy determiners are also implied. Examples are given in Table 1 for the three exemplar areas. Thus, for Definition 1--Goals or Intents--the policy determiners are seen as high level agents--members of the several state legislatures that have enacted community corrections programs; the U.S. Congress in the case of Public Law 94-142; and the Commission of Institutions of Higher Education within the various accrediting agencies. For Definitions 2 through 4, policy determiners tend to comprise lower level subordinate agents--the state criminal justice division together with the supervisors of actual implementers (typically referred to here as "street-level" bureaucrats after Lipsky, 1980) for CJCC; the state education agency with local supervisors for SPED; and regional association administrators in the case of HEAC. For Definitions 5 and 6, it is the operational implementers together with their immediate supervisors in all three areas. For Definition 7, all levels are involved, while for Definition 8 it is the client construction that counts.

3. Different definitions have policy formulated at different distances from the point of action. Thus Definition 1 formulates policy at a very distant point from the point of action; definitions 2 through 4 at

an intermediate point, and definitions 5 and 6 at a close point. Since definition 7 has policy made at all levels, the concept of proximity is not relevant. Definition 8 places policy formulation within the point of action, since what is policy by this definition is the constructions that clients make out of their experiences.

4. Finally, it is clear that these different definitions will produce policies of different complexions. In the case of Definition 1, policy "looks like" a set of ends. Definition 2 results in policy statements which look like rules, while Definition 3 results in guidelines with some built-in discretion. Definition 4 results in a set of tactics. Definition 5 results in expectations; 6 in norms; 7 in effects; and 8 in encounters. These differences in policy "appearance" will be further elucidated in the following section.

The Impact of Various Definitions

Table 2 (in eight parts) summarizes the essential information about impacts of each of the eight definitions in terms of five categories. The table is of course a judgment call; the reader is invited to deal with its intended principles rather than to critique particular entries.

1. The policy question. What is the essential question that the policy analyst would try to deal with given that he or she defined policy in each way? Policy questions are given for each of the three exemplar areas, e.g., given Definition #1, "Policy is an assertion of intents or goals," the CJCC analyst would ask, "What are the overall intents or goals of the community corrections programs?" Again, in relation to SPED, "What are the overall intents or goals of P.L. 94-142?" And so on. At the other extreme (Definition #8), the analyst would ask, "How would the clients describe the policy of the community corrections program as a result of their encounters with it? And so on.

2. The data collected. What kinds of data would the policy analyst collect given the policy question that a particular definition of policy poses? So for example, given Definition #1--goals and intents--the analyst might well collect, for CJCC, state and county level criminal justice statistics such as crime rates, arrests, incarcerations, paroles, and recidivism. He or she might conduct needs assessments, strengths assessments, and resource assessments, as well, and finally, solicit the opinions of various types of experts about what the intents or goals should be. Parallel data would be collected for SPED and HEAC. At the other extreme, in following Definition #8--client constructions--the analyst would be interested in collecting as many such constructions as possible.

3. The data sources utilized. The data stipulated in 2 above cannot of course be found just anywhere; knowing what data are wanted makes it possible to stipulate where they might be found. Sources may include (as they do for CJCC by Definition #1), groups of stakeholding persons, records, documents, position papers, court decisions, and groups of experts; others will be useful for other definitional situations. In the case of Definition #8 the sources will be almost exclusively clients, since it is their constructions that define policy.

4. The methodology employed. Different data sources imply different methodologies to be employed in tapping them. Thus personal constructions may require interviews and observations, records may require analysis, statistics may require numerical analysis, and so on. "Hearings" are a common form of input device to collect data from interest groups.

5. Policy products resulting. This row of Table 2 is by far the most interesting, since it is here that one can best appreciate the enormous differences that different selections of definitions of policy

will produce. So, for example, in CJCC, a definition of policy as "intent or goals" results in a policy analysis yielding up recommendations or prioritizations among goals such as reduction in costs of operating the prison system, lowering recidivism rates, providing a better fit of punishment to crime, and so on. This product is vastly different from, say, Definition #2, which results in recommendations of rules (e.g., Class C felons shall be eligible for consideration for the community corrections program); Definition 3's guidelines (e.g., a probation officer may recommend termination of sentence with the approval of the judge); Definition 4's sets of tactics (e.g., conducting community forums to overcome fear of corrections facilities being placed in neighborhoods); Definition 5's expectations (e.g., the parole officer shall be at all times responsible for knowing the whereabouts of his/her charges); Definition 6's norms (e.g., judges should accept plea bargains as necessary to keep their case load manageable); Definition 7's effects (e.g., widening the net of social control to include offenders who might otherwise be related; or Definition 8's client constructions (e.g., coercion and control).

The reader should satisfy himself/herself that the examples appearing in the "Policy Products" row of Table 2 can be reasonably construed as policies. It is probably the case that some of the examples given will "sound like" policies to the reader to a greater extent than will others--although it seems likely that this apparently greater validity is as much a function of what the reader normally takes to be policy as it is of any intrinsic property of the examples themselves. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to suggest a test, and the reader is invited to apply the following one. Using the stub, "It is the policy of this house to . . . ," complete the sentence by adding the various examples of Table 2. The term "house" can of course be understood to mean a program, a unit, an

agency, a legislature, or any other body or institution. By way of illustration, taking one example from Table 2 for the SPED area for each definition of policy:

Definition 1: Intents or Goals. It is the policy of this house to provide a free, appropriate public education for all.

Definition 2: Standing Decisions. It is the policy of this house to afford parents due process before placing any child in a special education program.

Definition 3: Discretionary Guide to Action. It is the policy of this house to permit a school psychologist to recommend placement in a gifted program of any child whose I.Q. falls between 115 and 125.

Definition 4: Problem-Solving Strategy. It is the policy of this house to use computer facilities to provide as much paperwork "boilerplate" as possible.

Definition 5: Sanctioned Behavior. It is the policy of this house to have regular classroom teachers consult with a resource teacher when unsure about how to handle a case. (Note that this policy statement differs from #2 and #4 above in that it is devised by implementers close to the point of action; it is less a rule or strategy than a self-developed rule-of-thumb; the behavior is "sanctioned" by virtue of the successful experience of implementers.)

Definition 6: Norms of Conduct. It is the policy of this house that administrators should reassign borderline cases as needed to manage teacher loads or to take account of the special circumstances of the child. (Note that this policy statement differs from #5 above in that norms are peer-developed accommodations to reality that have been worked out through mutual negotiation, even if only implicitly.)

Definition 7: Output of the Policy-Making System. It is the policy of this house to place more emphasis on keeping auditable records than on overcoming student problems. (Note that this is an analytic statement which deduces house policy from observations of behavior, analysis of records, etc. It may, as in this case, be an unwritten policy which is deduced, but one which is operative in controlling the behavior of policy-makers and implementers at all levels.)

Definition 8: Client Constructions. It is the policy of this house to deny entitlements such as adequate diagnosis, therapy, or prosthetic devices. (Note that this statement, like #7 above, is a deduction, based this time not on analysis but on client experience. Clients having made such constructions will act as though they were in fact house policy.)

The reader is invited to immerse himself/herself in Table 2; the meaning of this essay is lost without a thorough acquaintance with its contents.

Conclusions

Several conclusions may be drawn from the above analysis:

1. It is nonsense to ask the question, "What is the 'real' definition of policy?" No one of the definitions given above (or any others, for that matter) can stake a legitimate claim to priority. All of these definitions are constructions; none can claim tangible reality. Virtually any policy definition must be admitted so long as its proposer can make a rational case for his or her particular usage.

2. Nevertheless, not all definitions are equal in their consequences for policy analysis. Each definition calls for its own data, sources, and methods, and produces unique outcomes. Explicitly or tacitly, each different definition has an enormous impact on the processes and products of policy analysis.

3. The particular definition which an analyst elects to use should depend on his or her purpose in doing the analysis. Some definitions will always be "better" from the perspective of the analyst than others. When the Congress is seeking to set broad goals for the education of handicapped children, a definition of policy as goals or intents is clearly more meaningful than any other; indeed, certain others would not even be possible. Thus there can be no client constructions unless a program is already in place, for example.

4. What constitutes a "better" definition is of course a matter of values. Thus, the selection of a particular definition is a value choice. Certain definitions of policy are likely to be more resonant with the

analyst's values than will others. The political implications of this fact should not be overlooked, viz., that policy analysis may be used to advance certain values and to check others. The authoritarian policy board is not likely to be much interested in implementer norms or client constructions, for example. Policy analyses are not value-free; the outcome is heavily dependent on the definition of policy which the analyst explicitly or implicitly follows.

5. To be ethical, the policy analyst is obliged to point out the particular definition used in an analysis and to characterize its consequences for the variety of stakeholding audiences that might be concerned with the analysis. The best way to do that is to show, as in Table 2, what might happen if different definitions of policy were adopted. The best time to make this disclosure is prior to undertaking the analysis so that all stakeholding audiences may know what is involved and arrive at some consensus (if that is possible) before the analyst proceeds. If consensus is not possible, the analyst may need to develop different analyses for different audiences; reconciliation and accommodation then become the audiences' problem.

Notes

¹I am indebted to Dr. Dennis J. Palumbo, then director of the Center for Public Affairs at the University of Kansas, for having provided me the opportunity during the Summer of 1982 to develop the ideas expressed herein. His encouragement and support are gratefully acknowledged. Dr. Palumbo currently heads the Morrison Institute for Public Policy at Arizona State University

References

Lipsky, Michael. Street-Level Bureaucracy. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation, 1980.

TABLE 1

POLICY TYPES, DETERMINERS, APPEARANCES, AND PROXIMITY TO POINT OF ACTION FOR EIGHT DEFINITIONS OF "POLICY"

Policy Types	Policy Determiners	Definition of Policy	Proximity to Point of Action	Policy Looks Like
Policy-in-intention	CJCC: State Legislature SPED: U. S. Congress HEAC: Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of a Regional Accrediting Association	1--Goals or Intent	Distant	Ends
"	CJCC: State Criminal Justice Division + Local Supervisors SPED: State Education Agency + Local Supervisors HEAC: Regional Association Administrators	2--Standing Decisions	Intermediate	Rules
"	"	3--Guide to Discretionary Action	"	Guidelines
"	"	4--Problem-Solving Strategy	"	Sets of Tactics
Policy-in-Action	CJCC: Street-Level Bureaucrats + Local Supervisors SPED: Street-Level Bureaucrats + Local Supervisors HEAC: Street-Level Bureaucrats + Regional Association Administrators	5--Sanctioned Behavior	Close	Expectations
"	"	6--Norms of Conduct	"	Norms
"	ALL 3: All of the above	7--Output of the Policy-Making System	NA	Effects
Policy-in-Experience	ALL 3: Clients	8--Constructions Based on Experience	"Inside"	Encounters

TABLE 2

POLICY QUESTION, DATA COLLECTED, DATA SOURCES, METHODOLOGY, AND POLICY PRODUCTS FOR
EIGHT DEFINITIONS OF "POLICY" IN THREE EXEMPLAR AREAS: CJCC, SPED, AND HEAC

DEFINITION # 1: POLICY IS AN ASSERTION OF INTENTS OR GOALS.			
Item	CJCC	SPED	HEAC
Policy-Question:	What are the overall intents or goals of the community corrections program?	What are the overall intents or goals of PL 94-142?	What are the overall intents or goals of accreditation in higher education?
Data Collected:	State and county level criminal justice statistics, e.g., crime rates, arrests, incarcerations, paroles, recidivism; plus: needs assessments, strengths assessments, resource assessments, opinions of "experts"	National, state, and local level special education statistics, e.g., variety and rate of handicapping conditions; plus:	National, state, and local college and university statistics, e.g., admission data, program selection data, employment data; plus:
Data Sources:	Stakeholding audiences, e.g., general public, victims, offenders, judges, parole officers; state and county records; relevant documents, e.g., "white papers;" court decisions; "experts" such as university professors of political science and forensics and leading practitioners.	Stakeholding audiences, e.g., handicapped youngsters, parents, school boards, principals, teachers, special service providers; national, state, and local education agency records; position papers; court decisions; "experts" such as professors of special education and leading practitioners.	Stakeholding audiences, e.g., faculty and administrators, boards of trustees, students, parents, employers; position papers; national, state, and local college and university records; court decisions; "experts" such as university professors of higher education.
Methodology:	Statistical data analyses, interviews, observations, questionnaire studies, documentary analyses, "hearings."		
Policy Products:	listing of goals to be served; prioritized goals, e.g., reduction in costs of operating the criminal justice system, reduction in incarcerations, lowered recidivism, better fit of punishment to crime.	Listing of goals to be served; prioritized goals, e.g., free and public education for all, education in the least restrictive environment possible, reduction in stigma suffered by the handicapped, increase in general acceptance of the handicapped.	Listing of goals to be served; prioritized goals, e.g., assisting institutions to improve their program quality, inserting a "quality floor" in higher education, protecting the public against inferior institutions.

(Continued)

TABLE 2, Continued

DEFINITION # 2: POLICY IS A GOVERNING BODY'S "STANDING DECISIONS" BY WHICH IT REGULATES, CONTROLS, PROMOTES, SERVICES, AND OTHERWISE INFLUENCES MATTERS WITHIN ITS SPHERE OF AUTHORITY.

Item	CJCC	SPED	HEAC
Policy Question:	What rules should govern the decisions regularly made in implementing the community corrections program?	What rules should govern the decisions regularly made in implementing P. L. 94-142?	What rules should govern the decisions regularly made in implementing higher education accreditation standards?
Data Collected:	Decision-making roles and functions, e.g., state division of criminal justice, judges, probation officers, service providers. Types of decisions made by each. Timing of decisions. Impact of decisions, e.g., public safety, recidivism, relief of prison overcrowding, plea bargaining.	Decision-making roles and functions, e.g., state departments of education, superintendents, directors of special education, classroom teachers. Types of decisions made by each. Timing of decisions. Impact of decisions, e.g., least restrictive environment, stigma, grade achievement.	Decision-making roles and functions, e.g., review boards, evaluator consultants, review team chairpersons. Types of decisions made by each. Timing of decisions. Impact of decisions, e.g., failure to accredit, loss of funds by institution, appeal, court suit.
Data Sources:	State and county community corrections administrators, state and county statistical records, operating personnel, clients, other operating community corrections programs.	State and local education agency administrators, state and local education agency records, operating personnel, clients (including parents), classroom experiences.	Examining team reports, self-study reports, consultant evaluators, clients.
Methodology:	Questionnaire studies, records analyses, site visits.	Questionnaire studies, records analyses, site visits, evaluation reports.	Analysis of self-study and team reports, interviews with consultant evaluators and clients, questionnaire studies.
Policy Products:	Identification of needed decisions; recommendations for rules, e.g., Class C felons are eligible to be sentenced to community corrections programs, offenders who commit another felony shall be immediately resentenced to the state penitentiary.	Identification of needed decisions; recommendations for rules, e.g., parents must be afforded due process before children are placed in any special education program, local education agencies must establish a "child-find" program.	Identification of needed decisions; recommendations for rules, e.g., institutions must prepare an adequate self-study report, institutions have the right to veto a proposed evaluator-consultant.

(Continued)

TABLE 2, Continued

DEFINITION # 3: POLICY IS A GUIDE TO DISCRETIONARY ACTION.

Item	CJCC	SPED	HEAC
Policy Question:	What is the scope of discretionary action that can be tolerated in implementing the community corrections legislation?	What is the scope of discretionary action that can be tolerated in implementing Public Law 94-142?	What is the scope of discretionary action that can be tolerated in determining the accreditation status of a higher education institution?
Data Collected:	Action roles and functions, e.g., as in Definition # 2 above. Types of actions taken by each. Impact of actions, e.g., as in Definition # 2 above.	Action roles and functions, e.g., as in Definition # 2 above. Types of actions taken by each. Impact of actions, e.g., as in Definition # 2 above.	Action roles and functions, e.g., as in Definition # 2 above. Types of actions taken by each. Impact of actions, e.g., as in Definition # 2 above.
Data Sources:	As in Definition # 2 above.		
Methodology:	As in Definition # 2 above.		
Policy Products:	Identification of key action roles; recommendations for expectations with respect to each, recommendations for discretionary limits, "meta-rules," e.g., a probation officer may recommend termination of sentence with the approval of the judge, a county criminal justice administrator may determine the county's degree of involvement in the program: full, partial, or none.	Identification of key action roles; recommendations for expectations with respect to each, recommendations for discretionary limits, "meta-rules," e.g. the school psychologist may recommend placement in the gifted program for students whose measured I.Q. falls between 115 and 125, parents may elect to keep an EMR child in a regular classroom even though school staff recommend otherwise.	Identification of key action roles; recommendations for expectations with respect to each, recommendations for discretionary limits, "meta-rules," e.g., evaluator consultants may recommend non-accreditation if they believe the institution will be unable to provide funds for a viable program in the future, institutions may appeal if it is believed that their situation has been misassessed.

(Continued)

TABLE 2, Continued

DEFINITION # 4: POLICY IS A STRATEGY UNDERTAKEN TO SOLVE OR AMELIORATE SOME PROBLEM.

Item	CJCC	SPED	HEAC
Policy Question:	What strategies can be followed to minimize the problems that arise in implementing community corrections programs?	What strategies can be followed to minimize the problems that arise in implementing P.L. 94-142?	What strategies can be followed to minimize the problems that arise in implementing higher education accreditation processes?
Data Collected:	Types and frequencies of problems. Impact of each type of problem, e.g., prevents locating community corrections facilities in established neighborhoods, encourages offender to accept the classification imposed on him/her by the court as valid.	Types and frequencies of problems. Impact of each type of problem, e.g., assigns blacks disproportionately to the EMR category and whites to the LD category, overloads teachers with paperwork.	Types and frequencies of problems. Impact of each type of problem, e.g., tends to misassess special purpose institutions such as Bible colleges and chiropractic schools, biased toward re-accrediting formerly accredited institutions even in the face of program determinations to the contrary.
Data Sources:	Implementers, e.g., parole officers, judges; clients; other stakeholding audiences, e.g., general public, legislators; state and local records, e.g., recidivism, sentence completion, plea bargaining; actual experience.	Implementers, e.g., teachers, administrators, special service providers; clients; other stakeholding audiences, e.g., parents, state department of education monitors; national, state, and local records, e.g., increases in the number and type of handicapped served, amount of "paper" per served client.	Implementers, e.g., drafters of self-study reports, evaluator consultants; clients; other stakeholding audiences, e.g., students, employers; national, state, and local records, e.g., faculty credentials, enrollment data, placement data.
Methodology:	Statistical data analyses, interviews, observations, questionnaire studies, records analyses (including exception reports and monitoring reports), "hearings."		
Policy Products:	Identification of common, recurrent problems; sets of tactics for dealing with each, e.g., conducting community forums to overcome fear of corrections facilities being placed in neighborhoods, counseling to overcome negative self-image.	Identification of common, recurrent problems; sets of tactics for dealing with each, e.g., monitoring black-white distribution of cases over the several special education categories, using computer facilities to provide as much paperwork "boilerplate" as possible.	Identification of common, recurrent problems; sets of tactics for dealing with each, e.g., using special purpose faculty as evaluator consultants, emphasizing instructions to evaluator consultants to ignore previous accreditation in reaching judgments.

(Continued)

TABLE 2, Continued

DEFINITION # 5: POLICY IS SANCTIONED BEHAVIOR, FORMALLY THROUGH AUTHORITATIVE DECISIONS, OR INFORMALLY THROUGH EXPECTATIONS AND ACCEPTANCE, ESTABLISHED OVER ("SANCTIFIED BY") TIME.

Item	CJCC	SPED	HEAC
Policy Question:	What expectations should be set for implementers of community corrections programs, either as <u>a priori</u> prescriptions or as modified through experience?	What expectations should be set for implementers of P.L. 94-142, either as <u>a priori</u> prescriptions or as modified through experience?	What expectations should be set for implementers of higher education accreditation processes, either as <u>a priori</u> prescriptions or as modified through experience?
Data Collected:	Implementation roles and functions, e.g., parole officers, judges, special service providers; "expert" opinion about expectations reasonable for each role, e.g., from counterpart implementers from other sites; constructions of role incumbents.	Implementation roles and functions, e.g., regular and special education teachers, administrators, special service providers; "expert" opinion about expectations reasonable for each role, e.g., from counterpart roles at other sites; constructions of role incumbents.	Implementation roles and functions, e.g., evaluator consultants, review board members; "expert" opinion about expectations reasonable for each role, e.g., from counterpart implementers who have carried out other accreditations; constructions of role incumbents.
Data Sources:	Role incumbents and counterparts; site observations; activity reports.	Role incumbents and counterparts; site observations; activity reports; evaluation reports.	Role incumbents and counterparts; site observations; activity reports; evaluation reports; team reports.
Methodology:	As in Definition # 4 above.		
Policy Products:	Role definitions and corresponding expectations, e.g., the parole officer shall be at all times responsible for knowing the whereabouts of his/her charges, service providers shall follow the program plans they have filed with the county community corrections administrator.	Role definitions and corresponding expectations, e.g., regular classroom teachers shall consult with a resource teacher when they are unsure about how to handle a case, administrators should be knowledgeable about every special education child assigned to their buildings.	Role definitions and corresponding expectations, e.g., evaluator consultants shall inform University officials of the accreditation status to be recommended but not discuss it, review boards shall not overturn the recommendation of the visitation team without an input of additional evidence.

(Continued)

TABLE 2, Continued

DEFINITION # 6: POLICY IS A NORM OF CONDUCT, CHARACTERIZED BY CONSISTENCY AND REGULARITY, IN SOME SUBSTANTIVE ACTION AREA.			
Item	CJCC	SPED	HEAC
Policy Question:	What forms of conduct are consistently acceptable in agents who are implementing the community corrections program?	What forms of conduct are consistently acceptable in agents who are implementing P.L. 94-142?	What forms of conduct are consistently acceptable in agents who are implementing higher education accreditation processes?
Data Collected:	Implementation agents, e.g., judges, probation officers, special service providers; "tried and true" "satisficing" practices of local agents and counterpart agents elsewhere.	Implementation agents, e.g., regular and special education teachers, administrators, special service providers; "tried and true" "satisficing" practices of local agents and counterpart agents elsewhere.	Implementation agents, e.g., evaluator consultants, review board members; "tried and true" "satisficing" practices of local agents and counterpart agents elsewhere.
Data Sources:		As in Definition # 5 above.	
Methodology:		As in Definition # 4 above.	
Policy Products:	Descriptions of satisficing behavior and corresponding norms, e.g., parole officers should check the whereabouts of parolees sufficiently often to be comfortable about the possibility of absconding, judges should accept plea bargains as necessary to keep their case load manageable.	Descriptions of satisficing behavior and corresponding norms, e.g., teachers should keep paperwork up-to-date to satisfy any monitor, administrators should reassign borderline cases as needed to manage teacher loads or to take account of special circumstances of the child.	Descriptions of satisficing behavior and corresponding norms, e.g., evaluator consultants should check the data presented in the self-study at random as a means of validation, evaluator consultants should be less concerned with accreditability than in providing leverage to the institution in solving difficult problems.

(Continued)

TABLE 2, Continued

DEFINITION # 7: POLICY IS THE OUTPUT OF THE POLICY-MAKING SYSTEM: THE CUMULATIVE EFFECT OF ALL THE ACTIONS, DECISIONS, AND BEHAVIORS OF THE MILLIONS OF PEOPLE WHO WORK IN BUREAUCRACIES. IT OCCURS, TAKES PLACE, AND IS MADE AT EVERY POINT IN THE POLICY CYCLE, FROM AGENDA-SETTING TO POLICY IMPACT. AS SUCH, POLICY IS AN ANALYTIC CATEGORY.

Item	CJCC	SPED	HEAC
Policy Question:	What are the collective effects of the behaviors of the several implementers of the community corrections program?	What are the collective effects of the behaviors of the several implementers of P.L. 94-142?	What are the collective effects of the behaviors of the several implementers of higher education accreditation processes?
Data Collected:	Relevant laws, court decisions, executive orders, administrative guidelines, regulations, memoranda, instructions, behavior of street-level bureaucrats; responses to the above by clients; opinions of "experts."	Relevant laws, court decisions, state department of education directives, monitoring reports, guidelines, exemplars of common paperwork, behavior of the several implementer categories; responses to the above by clients and other stakeholding audiences, e.g., parents; opinions of "experts."	Relevant standards, guidelines, exemplar field reports and recommendations, minutes of review board sessions, appeals, behavior of administrators, evaluator consultants, and review board members; responses to the process by stakeholding audiences within the institutions; opinions of "experts."
Data Sources:	Law libraries, state and local county records, practices of agents at state and county sites and counterpart agents elsewhere, "experts" such as professors of political science and forensics and leading practitioners.	Law libraries, national, state, and local education agency records, practices of agents at state and local levels and counterpart agents elsewhere, "experts" such as professors of special education and leading practitioners.	Professional literature, accrediting association records, practices of agents within the association and at the candidate site, "experts" such as professors of higher education and leading practitioners, e.g., university administrators.
Methodology:	Statistical data analyses, documentary analyses, interview, observation, unobtrusive measures, investigative inquiry techniques.		
Policy Products:	Descriptions of collective effects, e.g., widening the net of social control to include offenders who might otherwise be released, increasing the range of acceptable plea bargaining.	Description of collective effects, e.g., determining who is "teachable," placing more emphasis on keeping auditable records than on overcoming student problems.	Description of collective effects, e.g., stigmatizing non-accredited institutions, diminishing the range of creativity in programming which institutions will be willing to risk.

(Continued)

TABLE 2, Concluded

DEFINITION # 8: POLICY IS THE IMPACT OF THE POLICY-MAKING AND POLICY-IMPLEMENTING SYSTEM AS IT IS EXPERIENCED BY THE CLIENT.			
Item	CJCC	SPED	HEAC
Policy Question:	How would the clients describe the policy of the community corrections program as a result of their experiences with it?	How would the clients describe the policy emanating from P.L. 94-142 as a result of their experiences with it?	How would the clients describe the policy of the accreditation process as a result of their experiences with it?
Data Collected:	Client constructions		
Data Sources:	Clients		
Methodology:	Interviews, observation, unobtrusive measures, investigative inquiry techniques.		
Policy Products:	Client constructions, e.g., coercion, control, reluctance to provide entitlements such as employment opportunities, addiction therapy.	Client constructions, e.g., stigma, babysitting rather than help, reluctance to provide entitlements such as adequate diagnosis, therapy, prosthetic devices.	Client constructions, e.g., negativism, overquick judgment, inadequate understanding, reluctance to provide entitlements such as fair hearings study of special circumstances.